

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/431,159	11/01/1999	YORAM BRONICKI	P-15149	8345	
759	90 07/25/2003				
NATH & ASSOCIATES			EXAMINER		
1030 FIFTEENTH STREET NW SIXTH FLOOR			DOROSHENK	DOROSHENK, ALEXA A	
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20005		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1764		
			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003	~ /	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			/6		
		Application N .	Applicant(s)		
		09/431,159	BRONICKI, YORAM		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Alexa A. Doroshenk	1764		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears n the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Fails - Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In solving time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 M	May 2002			
2a)⊠					
3)	/	is action is non-final.			
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under ion of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	rosecution as to the merits is 453 O.G. 213.		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	election requirement.	,		
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner				
10) 🔲 -	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	ted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exar	miner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) 🔲 -	The proposed drawing correction filed on				
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep				
12) 🔲 -	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Application	on No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Burdee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•		
14) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e	e) (to a provisional application).		
a) The translation of the foreign language provices that the control of the foreign language provices that the control of the foreign language provides the control of the	visional application has been rec	eived.		
Attachment					
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)		
S. Patent and Tr					

Application/Control Number: 09/431,159

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Dongen et al. (4,405,441) in view of van Klinken et al. (4,039,429) and Kwant et al. (4,200,519).

Van Dongen et al. discloses an apparatus comprising:

a heater for heating heavy hydrocarbons (401) and an atmospheric fractionating tower for fractionating the heated heavy hydrocarbon feed as a first atmospheric distilling unit (407) (Since a still contains both a heat source and a fractionating tower, the atmospheric distillation unit is equivalent to the heater and the atmospheric fractionating tower of the present invention);

a further heater and vacuum fractioning tower as vacuum distilling unit (408) for atmospheric bottoms (421);

a de-asphalting unit (409) for producing DAO (403) and asphaltenes (404) from said vacuum residue (402); and

a thermal cracker (412) for cracking de-asphalting unit oil (403) with recycle connections from an outlet (425) of the thermal cracker (412) to an inlet (418) of the atmospheric fractioning tower (407) (via 425, 428, 429, 405, 415, 416, 418).

Application/Control Number: 09/431,159

Art Unit: 1764

Van Dongen et al. further discloses wherein the light vacuum fractions may be subjected to thermal cracking (col. 1, lines 25-28) and further sites the van Klinken et al. reference as demonstrating the processing of such fractions.

Looking to the cited van Klinken et al. reference, the vacuum distilling zone (3) has light fraction (21) sent to a cracking zone (10) along with oil (23) from a deasphalting unit (4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide means, in the apparatus of Van Dongen et al., for supplying the vacuum light fractions to the thermal cracking unit (412) as it has been taught by van Klinken et al. that a single cracking unit is capable of cracking both vacuum light fractions and de-asphalting unit oil and since such further processing of vacuum light fractions by thermal cracking is recognized by Van Dongen et al. to be desirable.

The claims, as amended, recite wherein a line from said thermal cracker recycles only cracked oil to the inlet of the atmospheric fractionating tower. In view of the arguments presented by applicant and applicant's disclosure, this has been interpreted as wherein a line directly connects the cracker with the atmospheric fractionating tower for recycle of oil without any interposing distillation, fractionation or treatment units.

Van Dongen et al. discloses wherein oil is recycled from the thermal cracking unit (412) to an inlet (418) of the atmospheric fractioning tower (407) via 425, 428, 429, 405, 415, 416, 418 wherein an additional atmospheric distillation unit, a vacuum distillation unit and catalytic hydro-treating unit are interposed.

Application/Control Number: 09/431,159

Art Unit: 1764

Kwant et al. also teaches a process for the preparation of oil wherein thermally cracked product (11) is recycled directly from a thermal cracking zone (4) to the inlet (12) of a first atmospheric distillation zone (3), demonstrating that cracked oil can be directly recycled to an atmospheric distillation zone, without interposing treatments, and a system will continue to be fully operational.

It is held that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to eliminate the interposing units and their functions in the recycle line of Van Dongen et al. because the omission of an element and its function where not needed (as demonstrated by Kwant et al.) is obvious. <u>Ex parte Rainu</u>, 168 USPQ 375 (PTO Bd. of Appl. 1969).

Response to Arguments

35 USC 103 Rejections

van Klinken et al. in view of Friday et al.

In view of applicant's proper statement of evidence to disqualify the Friday et al. reference, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Van Dongen et al. in view of van Klinken et al.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1764

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexa A. Doroshenk whose telephone number is 703-305-0074. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 9:00 AM - 7:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 703-308-6824. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1100

Art Unit: 1764

Page 6

AAD July 22, 2003